



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/748,477

12/30/2003

Kay L. Grasso

CRNC.107715

7079

46169 7590 04/02/2009
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
Intellectual Property Department
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER

SQUIRES, ELIZA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/02/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/748,477	Applicant(s) GRASSO ET AL.	
	Examiner Eliza Squires	Art Unit 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 26-29, 41 and 46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 26-29 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/30/09 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/2/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 1-7, 26-29, 41 and 46 in the reply filed on 22 January 2009 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 8-25, 30-40, 42-45, and 47-50 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected subcombination, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 22 January 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. **Claims 1-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to a machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. In re Bilski et al, 88 USPQ 2d 1385 CAFC (2008); Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim

Art Unit: 3626

should positively recite the particular machine to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Here, applicant's method steps fail the first prong of the new Federal Circuit decision since they are not tied to a machine and can be performed without the use of a particular machine.

The recitation of a "method in a computer system" in the preamble is insufficient to overcome this rejection, because it is not clear which, if any, method steps are being performed by a computer processor.

5. **Claims 26-29 and 41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are directed towards software per se which is non-statutory. A system is an apparatus comprised of various structural components, these claims, however, recite different computer programming elements or modules for performing certain functions. Being absent any structural components such as a computer system, memory, computer readable medium, etc., the claims recite simply descriptive material, i.e. software per se. Claim 41 is similarly rejected as the claim may be directed towards computer software per se.

Art Unit: 3626

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. **Claims 1-7, 41, and 46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims contain conditional statements such as “if so, outputting information...” “even though it is too soon...” “wherein it is not safe...” however the claims offer no alternative for if the condition was not met. These statements render the claims indefinite.

8. Claim element “means for recieving” “means for determining” is a means (or step) plus function limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. However, the written description fails to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function such that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function.

Applicant is required to:

(a) Amend the claim so that the claim limitation will no longer be a means (or step) plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or

(b) Amend the written description of the specification such that it clearly links or associates the corresponding structure, material, or acts to the claimed function without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or

Art Unit: 3626

(c) State on the record where the corresponding structure, material, or acts are set forth in the written description of the specification that perform the claimed function. For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2181.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. **Claims 1-7, 26-29, 41, and 46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by anticipated by “Combining Tabular, Rule-Based, and procedural Knowledge in Computer-Based Guidelines for Childhood Immunization” by *Miller et al.*

11. **As to claim 1**, *Miller* discloses a method in a computer system for preventing one or more immunizations from being administered to a person too early, the method comprising:

receiving the immunizations to be administered to a person (*Miller* abstract and page 212);

determining whether it is too soon to administer the immunization (*Miller* page 221 wherein the program determines whether “the dose is not yet due”); and

if so, outputting information that the immunization being administered too soon (*Miller* page 214 wherein the system outputs doses which were given to soon).

12. **As to claim 2**, see the discussion of claim 1, additionally, *Miller* discloses the method of further comprising:

determining whether it is still safe to administer the immunization even though it is too soon to administer the immunization (*Miller* page 219 wherein the system determines a recommended age (at which the dose should be scheduled) and a minimum acceptable age (at which the dose may be given if the child happens to be at the clinic)).

Art Unit: 3626

13. **As to claim 3**, see the discussion of claims 1 and 2, additionally, *Miller* discloses the method wherein if it is safe to administer the immunization, outputting information that it is safe to administer the immunization (*Miller* page 225 figure 9 and pages 214 and 215).

14. **As to claim 4**, see the discussion of claim 1 and 2, additionally, *Miller* discloses the method wherein if it is not safe to administer the immunization, outputting information that it is not safe to administer the immunization (*Miller* page 225 figure 9 and pages 214 and 215).

15. **As to claim 5**, see the discussion of claim 1, additionally, *Miller* discloses the method further comprising:

obtaining information regarding the safe timing of immunizations from a database (*Miller* abstract and page 219).

16. **As to claim 6**, see the discussion of claim 1 and 5, additionally, *Miller* discloses the method further comprising:

obtaining information from an electronic medical record of the person stored within a comprehensive healthcare system (*Miller* page 212).

17. **As to claim 7**, see the discussion of claims 1 and 5-6, additionally, *Miller* discloses the method further comprising:

utilizing the information from the electronic medical record of the person and the information regarding safe timing of immunizations to determine whether an immunization is being administered too soon (*Miller* page 212, 214-215, and page 219).

Art Unit: 3626

18. **As to claim 26**, *Miller* discloses a system in a computerized environment for preventing one or more immunizations from being administered to a person too early, the system comprising:

a receiving module for receiving the immunizations to be administered to a person (*Miller* abstract and page 212);

a determining module for determining whether it is too soon to administer the immunization (*Miller* page 221 wherein the program determines whether “the dose is not yet due”); and

an outputting module for outputting information that the immunization being administered too soon (*Miller* page 214 wherein the system outputs doses which were given to soon).

19. **As to claim 27**, see the discussion of claim 26, additionally, *Miller* discloses the system further comprising a second determining module for determining whether it is still safe to administer the immunization even though it is too soon to administer the immunization (*Miller* page 219 wherein the system determines a recommended age (at which the dose should be scheduled) and a minimum acceptable age (at which the dose may be given if the child happens to be at the clinic)).

20. **As to claim 28**, see the discussion of claim 26-27, additionally, *Miller* discloses the system wherein if it is safe to administer the immunization, outputting information that it is safe to administer the immunization (*Miller* page 225 figure 9 and pages 214 and 215).

Art Unit: 3626

21. **As to claim 29**, see the discussion of claim 26-27, additionally, *Miller* discloses the system wherein if it is not safe to administer the immunization, outputting information that it is not safe to administer the immunization (*Miller* page 225 figure 9 and pages 214 and 215).

22. **As to claim 41**, *Miller* discloses a system in a computerized environment for preventing one or more immunizations from being administered to a person too early, the system comprising:

means for receiving the immunizations to be administered to a person (*Miller* abstract and page 212);

means for determining whether it is too soon to administer the immunization (*Miller* page 221 wherein the program determines whether “the dose is not yet due”); and

if so, outputting information that the immunization being administered too soon (*Miller* page 214 wherein the system outputs doses which were given to soon).

23. **As to claim 46**, *Miller* discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method, the method comprising:

receiving the immunizations to be administered to a person (*Miller* abstract and page 212);

determining whether it is too soon to administer the immunization (*Miller* page 221 wherein the program determines whether “the dose is not yet due”); and

if so, outputting information that the immunization being administered too soon (*Miller* page 214 wherein the system outputs doses which were given to soon).

Art Unit: 3626

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. “All in One Shot” by Paul Swiech discusses a “...computer records program that would flag a vaccine if a patient already has received it or would get it too soon”.

Art Unit: 3626

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eliza Squires whose telephone number is (571)270-7052. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8 am - 4 pm Eastern Standard Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Gilligan can be reached on 571-272-6770. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eliza Squires/
Examiner, Art Unit 3626
3/17/09

/C. Luke Gilligan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3626